

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor	: Kevin I. Bertness	Confirmation No.: 3178
Appln. No.	: 10/791,141	Group Art Unit: 2858
Filed	: March 2, 2004	Examiner: Aaron C. Piggush
For	: AUTOMOTIVE BATTERY CHARGING SYSTEM TESTER	
Docket No.	: C382.12-0178	

---

**RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

*FILED ELECTRONICALLY ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2011*

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS  
BEING TRANSMITTED VIA THE PATENT  
OFFICE EFS, TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR  
PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA  
22313-1450, THIS

19TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2011.

HUDSON K. CHAMPLIN  
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 22, 2011. With this response, all pending claims 115-142 are presented for consideration and favorable action.

This is filed in connection with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

In the Office Action, the rejection was based upon Gollomp (U.S. Pat. No. 6,424,157) in view of Roberts (U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,385).

Independent claim 115 includes prompting an operator to input information related to a battery under test using an input. However, this element is not found in the Gollomp reference. Applicant respectfully requests that it be clarified where in the references it is disclosed that an operator is prompted to input information related to a battery under test using an input.

Further, the claimed invention describes providing "a charge battery" output. However, providing "a charge battery" output is not shown in the Gollomp reference. Applicant has reviewed the cited sections of Gollomp and is unable to find where that reference shows a charge

battery output which is based upon a measured starting voltage being low relative to a threshold and a battery test result which is indicative of a battery which is not fully charged. Thus, clarification as to where this element is found in the cited references is respectfully requested.

The claims describe providing “a cranking voltage low output.” In the Response to Argument section, the Office Action stated, “the citations provided in the rejections above concerning Gollomp are still seen as meeting those requirements, especially when noting the messages provided by the display in Gollomp and their equivalent meaning.” However, Gollomp simply does not show providing “a cranking voltage low output.” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests clarification as to where in Gollomp is “a cranking voltage low output” provided. Applicant has reviewed the cited sections in the Office Action and is simply unable to find a cranking voltage low determination which is based upon both the starting voltage as compared to a threshold and a battery test result indicating a fully charged battery.

The claimed invention further describes providing “a cranking voltage normal output.” However, the element of providing “a cranking voltage normal output” is simply not shown in the Gollomp reference. Thus, it is respectfully requested that it be pointed out to the Applicant where in the Gollomp reference the element of providing “a cranking voltage normal output” is found. Again, the Applicant has reviewed the cited sections of Gollomp and the reference simply does not show such an output based upon the starting voltage being normal relative to a threshold and the battery test result indicative of a fully charged battery.

Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to hold an interview with the Examiner to discuss the pending claims and their relationship to the cited references.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action’s characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim

does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejection claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Judson K. Champlin/

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244  
Phone: (612) 334-3222  
Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:DPP:lrs:rev